

18124

ment had been adopted, I would have supported the wilderness bill. Since it was defeated, I voted against the bill.

Much as I wish to support conservation measures, the greatest conservation issue before us is the question of conserving the Constitution of the United States. In the interest of that kind of conservation, I opposed the wilderness bill, in the form in which it passed the Senate. I hope the Members of the House of Representatives will give the most careful attention to this constitutional question and will pass a bill which will preserve both the wilderness areas and the traditional role of the Congress.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there further morning business? If there is no further morning business, morning business is closed.

#### MOSCOW CLAIMS VICTORY IN THE CONGO

Mr. DODD. Mr. President, last Friday, I rose in the Senate to warn that United Nations policy in the Congo, if it were not quickly reversed, would inevitably lead to a complete Communist takeover in that country.

On Monday, I submitted in the Senate a resolution calling for the establishment of a select committee of the Senate to investigate the Congo situation. Simultaneously, I sent to Ambassador Stevenson a telegram urging him to insist that the U.N. suspend all action against the government of President Tshombe, of Katanga, and against white officers and white advisers serving under that government.

Only hours after I had submitted my resolution on Monday, there came to my attention an article, in the official Soviet periodical *New Times*, which claims a complete victory for the pro-Soviet side in the Congo and paints a far blacker picture than I, myself, did on the basis of the information available to me Monday morning.

The article to which I refer appeared in the Russian language edition of the *Moscow New Times*, for September 8, which arrived in this country only Monday morning. The English language version of *New Times* should reach this country within the next week. Meanwhile, because I consider the article of such critical importance, I wish to present a translation of the text at the conclusion of my remarks. To the best of my knowledge, this will be the first translation available in the English language.

The article on the Congo in the *Moscow New Times* points out that the members of political parties of the national bloc which was headed by Patrice Lumumba have 23 seats in this government, or an absolute majority; that "the decision of the Parliament permits the new government to carry out all decisions made earlier by the Lumumba government; that Prime Minister Cyrille Adoula has accepted the request of Vice Premier Gizenga to appoint Gen. Victor Lundula as Chief of the United Congolese Army, and to fill the position of Minister of Defense and representative to the United

Nations with Gizenga followers; that Adoula has further agreed to take certain unspecified measures against Colonel Mobutu, and that Gizenga is now demanding the removal from the army of all soldiers and officers who are against the unity of the country; and, that Gizenga, in a telegram to Adoula had called for an end to the separatist activity in Katanga, to preserve the territorial unity of the Republic within the framework of the policy of Patrice Lumumba, our adherence to which we have declared.

The article boasted that "the decision of the Parliament commits the new government to carry out all decisions made earlier by the Lumumba government, and factually cancels as illegal the decisions of the so-called Ileo government."

Mr. President, in the light of this information, I believe the situation in the Congo is even graver than I have previously described it. I believe that unless the United States can use its influence to reverse United Nations policy, or else to bring about a stay in the execution of this policy until there has been time for a reappraisal of the entire situation, the Congo, within a matter of months, will be irrevocably lost to the free world and to the Congolese people.

If there is anyone who still cherishes illusions about the possibility of achieving a middle-of-the-road solution through the coalition government which the U.N. has fostered and to which it is now giving all-out support, I would urge them to read the article in the *Moscow New Times*.

There is no talk in this article about any middle-of-the-road solution or of compromise with the non-Communists. The language of the article, on the contrary, is completely uncompromising. It speaks of nothing less than total victory and of the elimination of all those who oppose the institution of a Khrushchev-Gizenga new order in the Congo.

Because I considered this article in the *Moscow New Times* to be of such grave significance, I forwarded a translation to President Kennedy, as soon as it became available to me Monday afternoon.

The press has hinted in the past that the administration was not altogether happy about United Nations policy in the Congo. In my wire to Ambassador Stevenson, I expressed the hope that present U.N. policy in that unhappy country did not enjoy the sanction and approval of the United States. For my own part, I simply cannot believe that President Kennedy has been provided with all the facts on this tortured situation.

Mr. President, the situation in the Congo can be redeemed. If the Kremlin had to act in its own right and with its own resources in the Congo, it would be completely helpless because of the thousands of miles that separate it from the African heartland. Geographically and logistically the Congo belongs to our sphere of operations, not the Soviet sphere.

There is no reason why the Congo should go Communist. There is every reason why it should remain free. But the dismal fact nevertheless is that the

Congo is rapidly slipping under complete Communist control. If the Congo does go Communist, it will not be because of Soviet strength or because the Congolese people want communism; it will be because of U.N. policy in the Congo and because of the perverse folly that induces us to support this policy with our prestige and our money.

The words "perverse folly" are strong words, but I have used them with all deliberation. We are paying more than half of the \$100 million that the United Nations has already budgeted or spent in the Congo. Could there be any folly greater or more perverse than financing the destruction of our friends and the victory of our enemies?

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to insert into the Record at the conclusion of my remarks the translation of the article entitled "The Development of the Events in Congo," by E. Primakov, which appeared in *New Times*, No. 37, September 8, 1961. I also ask unanimous consent to have inserted the text of my letter transmitting this translation to President Kennedy.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered. (See exhibits 1 and 2.)

Mr. DODD. In the light of this article in *New Times*, Mr. President, I again express the hope that it will be possible for the Senate, before Congress adjourns, to pass on the resolution I presented Monday calling for the establishment of a select committee on the Congo.

I think this matter is so urgent that, unless some action of this kind is taken, the Congo will inevitably become another part of the world Communist bloc.

This would be a great tragedy. It would be another in the list of tragedies that have been occurring and recurring with a frequency that is difficult to explain or even to understand.

We have been pouring out of our substance billions of dollars to give comfort and aid to our sworn enemy. If there is any objective historian left to write about our times, and if his writings are preserved for posterity, I am confident that, when he reviews what we have been doing over the last 8 or 9 years, he will have to say we were, indeed, strange people and that we were guilty of the greatest folly.

I have told my colleagues in the Senate within the last few weeks of the fact that the World Bank, in which we have membership, only a few weeks before the election in British Guiana, loaned the Communist, Cheddi Jagan, \$1,250,000. Jagan came to Washington and personally negotiated that loan. He went back to British Guiana figuratively waving the check in the face of the people of British Guiana.

Jagan is a Communist. But he was able to say to these people, who had to make a decision with respect to him and the other two candidates, "Now you see what the United States thinks. I went to Washington and came back with \$1,250,000." He won the election by only three seats. But our representative on the World Bank approved that